REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in conjunction with a concurrently-filed request for reconsideration as follows:

The Rejection of claims 1-8, 12, and 13 as being anticipated by Lee (2002/0057247)

Claim 1 is directed to an advantageous power controller that solves the moiré problem encountered in prior art still modes without suffering from the lamp malfunction issues as the LCD display switches from still to moving picture modes as discussed by the Applicant on, for example, paragraphs 59 and 60. In that regard, claim 1 recites a "a mode setting unit for outputting a control signal according to a display mode." An example of such a unit is shown as element 700 in Applicant's Figure 1. As can be seen in Figure 2, an inverter control unit receives the control signal from the mode setting unit to control whether a timing signal is selectively output [to an inverter], which is reflected in claim 1 through the recitation of a "an inverter control unit for selectively outputting a timing signal received from the outside according to the control signal from the mode setting unit." Given this selective output of a timing signal, the inverter of claim 1 is "is operated in a synchronous mode when the timing signal is received from the inverter control unit, and in an asynchronous mode when the timing signal is not received from the inverter control unit."

The Lee reference stands in sharp contrast. In particular, Lee's inverter has no synchronous or asynchronous operation whatsoever. Instead, Lee's reference in paragraph [0105] to a vertical synchronization signal Vsync and a horizontal synchronization signal control the starting up of the display. As the display turns on, timing controller 100 (in Lee's Figure 3) delays an ON command to the inverter 700 for a predetermined time (such as one second). This may be further seen in Lee's Figure 6, where a switch 516 controlled by timing controller 100 determines whether B/L (backlight) control signal turns on the inverter. Thus, Lee's inverter 700 is either turned on or off by the B/L (backlight) control signal – there is no synchronous or asynchronous operation of this inverter whatsoever with regard to any timing signal.

Moreover, consider the mode setting unit of claim 1 as compared to 400 and 520 of

Lee's Figure 6. As shown by Lee's Figure 6, element 400 is a DC-DC power converter that provides a bias voltage to a switch 520 that either outputs the bias voltage (from the DC-DC power converter) or a Vcom signal from the timing controller to the LCD panel. Lee's elements 400 and 520 thus have no ability to control the switches in element 510 of Lee's Figure 6. However, the Final Office Action states that element 510 satisfies the inverter controller unit of claim 1. That this cannot be so is shown by Lee's Figure 6: for elements 400 and 520 to satisfy the mode setting unit of claim 1, these elements would have to control whether the element 510 allowed a timing signal to flow to inverter 700. However, Lee's element 510 is under no control whatsoever from the DC-DC power converter 400 (and its output switch 520). Thus, these elements cannot possibly be construed as to anticipate the recited mode control unit and inverter control. Moreover, even if Lee's DC-DC power converter 400 (which merely provides a DC bias voltage) was (improperly) construed as controlling the switch 516 in element 510, switch 516 is not providing a timing signal but is instead merely providing either an ON or OFF command to the inverter. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2 and 3 are patentable over the Lee reference.

Claim 4 has been amended to reflect that "the lamp emits light in synchronism with the timing signal during the synchronous mode and asynchronously with the timing signal during the asynchronous mode." As discussed by the Applicants on, for example, paragraphs 59 and 60, such a synchronous and asynchronous operation of the lamp solves the moiré problem encountered in prior art still modes without suffering from the lamp malfunction issues as the LCD display switches from still to moving picture modes. The Lee reference stands in sharp contrast in that the Lee reference is entirely silent regarding such synchronous or asynchronous operation of its lamp (let alone the asynchronous or asynchronous control of its inverter as discussed with regard to claim 1).

As discussed with analogously with regard to claim 1, the mode control unit described in paragraphs [0100] to [0105] of Lee is incapable of functioning as claimed in applicant's claim 4: specifically, the mode control unit as recited in claim 4 is limited "for outputting a control signal according to a display mode." Given this control signal from the mode control unit, claim 4 further recites "an inverter control unit for selectively outputting

the timing signal received from the timing controller according to the control signal from the mode setting unit." The lamp responds to the timing signal as discussed above. Accordingly, the mode control unit of claim 1 acts to control the lamp because its control signal controls the outputting of the timing signal from the inverter control unit to the lamp's inverter. In contrast, Lee's B/L control signal of Figures 3 and 6 merely serves to either turn on or turn off the inverter. Accordingly, claim 4 and its dependent claims 5, 6, and 7 are allowable over the Lee reference. Claim 8 has been amended analogously as discussed with regard to claim 1 so that claim 8 and its dependent claims 10-16 are allowable over Lee for analogous reasons.

The Rejections of claims 9-11 and 14-16 as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Park (20020130830)

The Park reference does nothing to cure the infirmities of the Lee reference as discussed above with regard to independent claims 1, 4, and 8. Accordingly, the pending claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

In addition, the specification has been amended to address some minor typographical errors.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, applicants' request reconsideration and withdrawal of the grounds of rejection and passage of the application to issue with claims 1-16. Should Examiner desire to discuss the application, please contact the undersigned at (949) 752-7040.

If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at (949) 752-7040 is welcomed and encouraged.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. 50-2257.

Certificate of EFS Web Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted via EFS Web Transmission to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Jon Hallman

~~Sandra L. Carr~~ Jonathan W. Hallman

Date of Signature March 31, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Hallman

Jonathan W. Hallman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 42,622
Customer No. 32,605